

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present response, claims 15-34 will have been resubmitted for consideration by the Examiner. Claims 31-34 have been amended to eliminate language informalities. Thus, claims 15-34 are pending in the present application.

In view of the herein contained remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed action provided.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOMAT (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,499) and OS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,304). The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOMAT and OS et al. in view of SHIMA (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0004802). The Examiner rejected claims 24 and 25 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOMAT and OS et al. in view of TOMAT (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,925). Claims 20, 21 and 27-34 were rejected under the same rationale as claims 15-19 and 22-26.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above-noted rejections and submits that they are inappropriate with respect to the combinations of features recited in each of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant traverses each of these rejections, requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof together with an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application, in due course.

Applicant's invention is directed to a terminal apparatus that is configured to receive image data from a scanner. The terminal apparatus comprises an interface configured to be connected to the scanner by a network. The terminal apparatus includes a memory configured to store information indicating a plurality of file types and an application program associated with each of the plurality of file types, each of the application programs being configured to open a document file associated with at least one of the plurality of the file types.

The terminal apparatus further includes a controller that is configured to receive, from the scanner, a control file including a file name and to also receive from the scanner, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner. The controller is additionally configured to analyze the file name included in the received control file to obtain the file type of the received document file, and to search the memory, to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type, from the application programs stored in memory. The controller is additionally configured to start the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based on the application program determined in the search of the memory.

Independent claim 20 recites a network system including a scanner and a terminal apparatus as generally described above while independent claim 21 recites a generally related communication method.

In direct contrast, and as the Examiner admitted in the outstanding Official Actions mailed on August 3, 2006, and October 25, 2006, TOMAT is deficient in that it does not disclose at least a controller that searches the memory to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory and that starts the

application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program determined in the search.

Thus, it is admitted that the features recited in Applicant's pending claims are not disclosed in or suggested by TOMAT cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, the pending claims are distinguished over TOMAT, at least for this explicitly admitted reason.

In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner relies on OS et al. to overcome the deficiencies of TOMAT. OS et al. relates to a scanner which utilizes software to automate the entire scanning process. The software in the scanning system analyzes a host computer and automatically maps user interface buttons of the scanner with application programs installed on the host computer. The software in the scanner also establishes appropriate predefined scan configurations for each application program mapped to the user interface buttons. When one of the user-interface buttons is pressed, the scanning process is invoked to generate a scanned image of a document. The scanned image is automatically delivered to the application program mapped to the pressed button. Thus the application programs of OS et al. (e.g., in step 61, Fig. 2) relate to the scanning process itself, not to opening a document file, as recited.

Further, Applicant notes that OS et al. refers to a scanner and a scanning system but does not refer to a terminal apparatus that is configured to receive image data from a scanner and to open a received document file. Thus, at least for this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the various features of OS et al. that are relied upon by the Examiner are not directly relevant to the claims of the present application which refers to a terminal apparatus that is configured to receive image data from a scanner. The shortcomings of TOMAT to which the Examiner admits relates to features of the controller of the terminal apparatus. These deficiencies do not relate to

features of the scanner itself. Thus, again, the relevance of the scanner of OS et al. is not directly applicable to the admitted deficiencies of TOMAT.

OS et al. does not disclose at least a controller (that is part of a terminal apparatus that is connected to a scanner) that searches the memory (of the terminal apparatus) to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory (of the terminal apparatus) and that starts the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program determined in the search.

Rather, according to OS et al. blocks 51-69 of Fig. 2 show an operation of the scanner, but do not relate to any operation of the host computer. In particular, at block 69, the scanner drops (delivers) the scanned image into a display of the identified application program (col. 5, lines 61-65). After the delivery of the scanned image at step 69, the process loops to step 57, but Fig. 2 does not contain any relevant disclosure regarding an operation of the host computer which is illustrated in Fig. 7. Applicant notes that the present invention does not recite features of a scanner, but recites a terminal apparatus configured to receive image data from a scanner. Thus, OS et al. does not contain any relevant disclosure regarding a controller of a terminal apparatus that searches the memory of the terminal apparatus to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory and that starts the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program determined in the search.

OS et al. utilizes scanning hardware and associated software to automate an entire scanning process. While the software analyzes the host computer, such analysis is for the purpose of mapping user interface buttons of the scanner to application programs of the host

computer. The software also establishes predefined scan configurations for each application program mapped to the user interface buttons. Accordingly, when one of the user interface buttons of the scanner is pressed, the scanning process is utilized to generate a scanned image of a document and the scanned image is automatically delivered to the application program that is mapped (i.e., associated) with the pressed button.

However, these features of OS et al. do not contain any disclosure of a controller of a terminal apparatus that is configured to receive from the scanner, a control file including a file name and to receive from the scanner a document file that includes image data scanned by the scanner. Moreover, OS et al. does not contain a controller that analyzes the file name included in a received control file to obtain the file type of the received file document or to search the memory of the terminal apparatus to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type, from the application program stored in the memory of the terminal apparatus. Finally, OS et al. does not teach a controller that is configured to start an application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based on the application program determined in the search by the controller of the terminal apparatus.

In this regard, in setting forth the rejection, the Examiner makes particular reference to OS et al., col. 3, lines 35 through col. 4, line 14. However, col. 3, line 35, describes Fig. 2 of OS et al. which is a flow diagram illustrating the setup and operation of the scanner of Fig. 1. This figure does not relate to the terminal apparatus which appears to correspond to the host computer. Moreover, the processes of steps 51, 53 and 55 of Fig. 2 merely relate to the installation of the software program, as is explicitly set forth at col. 5, lines 35-39. In other words, since the portion of OS et al. referred to by the Examiner as supporting the features of the claimed controller of Applicant's invention relate only to the installation of the software of the scanner,

but do not relate to the operation of the scanner and certainly not to a terminal apparatus, these features cannot comply with the recitations of Applicant's claims which relate the usage of the terminal apparatus rather than the initial configuration of the scanner by the installation of scanner software.

Thus, the pending claims are distinguished over OS et al.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant's pending claims are not disclosed in or suggested by any proper combination of TOMAT and OS et al. cited by the Examiner. In particular, even the proposed combination of TOMAT and OS et al. would not include a controller of a terminal apparatus that is configured to search the memory of the terminal apparatus to determine an application program associated with the obtained file type of the application programs stored in the memory of the terminal apparatus or to start the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based on the application program determined in the search by the controller of the terminal apparatus. These are features of the operation of the device rather than features of the installation of a software program which is to what the noted portions of OS et al. are directed. Thus, the pending claims are also submitted to be patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination, since even the combination of TOMAT and OS et al. does not disclose the combinations of features recited in Applicant's pending claims.

Moreover, the Examiner has not set forth a proper motivation for combining TOMAT with OS et al. TOMAT does not disclose at least a controller that searches the memory to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory and that starts the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program

determined in the search. On the other hand, OS et al. contains no disclosure regarding an operation of the host computer, in the manner recited in Applicants' claims.

In particular, TOMAT is directed to technology for transmitting an image to a remote recipient. In direct contrast, OS et al. is directed to scanning an image and displaying the image on the scanner. OS et al. does not relate to transmitting the scanned image at all. Accordingly, there is no reason to combine the teachings of TOMAT and OS et al. as proposed by the Examiner. In this regard, Applicant notes that the citations by the Examiner to TOMAT at col. 8 regarding receiving the control file and at col. 14 regarding analyzing the file name, relate to the recipient of the image file. However, the features of OS et al. that the Examiner proposes to combine therewith as features of the controller, relate to the installation of software to control a scanner and are unrelated to the recipient of the image data since OS et al. displays the scanned image on a display of the scanner. Accordingly, there is no logical basis for the Examiner's proposed combination.

In regard to the rejection of claims 16-19 and 22, Applicant does not dispute the conventionality of the Lpr/Lpd protocol per se nor of displaying image data on a display of a terminal in the form of a thumbnail, per se. However, the utilization of these various features of Applicant's invention, in the manner recited in the various combinations of Applicant's claims, is not taught, disclosed nor rendered obvious, regardless of whether these features themselves are disclosed by SHIMA.

Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 24 and 25 are respectively dependent from allowable independent claim 15, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed supra. Thus, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least the reasons discussed supra. Further,

all dependent claims set forth a further combination of elements neither taught nor disclosed by any of the applied references.

Regarding the Examiner's assertions regarding claims 26, 30 and 34, Applicant submits that the Examiner is incorrect. In fact, the Examiner's position is explicitly contradicted by col. 10, lines 22-26.

For each of the above-noted reasons and certainly for all of the above-noted reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections, as set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action, are inappropriate and should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of the pending claims, in due course. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has not amended the pending claims (except to eliminate an informality) but has re-submitted the rejected claims for consideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicant has discussed the disclosure of the references relied upon by the Examiner, and the features recited in the claims, and has pointed out the shortcomings of the references with respect thereto, as well as the lack of any proper motivation for the combination. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis for the patentability of all the claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication to such effect in due course.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Yutaka IYOKI



Bruce H. Bernstein

Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

December 26, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191